

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED CONCERNING THE "DRAFT" LAKE  
CUMBERLAND MASTER PLAN SUPPLEMENT ADDRESSING REAL ESTATE  
EASEMENTS FOR LAKE ACCESS/BOAT LAUNCHING**

**A. Comments Relating to the Draft Supplement:**

1. Comment - A moratorium on all future access points, i.e. launching ramps allowed on the lake. Protect the ones we have from continued erosion.

Response - One of the primary purposes of this Supplement to the Master Plan is to optimize safety and launching opportunities at existing outgranted areas before consideration is given to new sites. While some sections of the lake have abundant launching facilities, other sections of the lake do not. Population densities have changed tremendously over the last 50 years resulting in some highly populated areas of the lake with inadequate launching facilities to serve the existing public demand. It is our intention to identify these under-developed areas of the lake through a future carrying capacity study.

2. Comment - The DRAFT shows that Wilson Street/Caney Fork has more development potential than John Street even though the Wilson Street Access goes dry in late October.

Response - Various factors are used to determine the potential for additional development and improvement of existing sites. Some of these include water depth, condition of access roads to the site, potential for additional parking, overall terrain and slope of the launching site. In cases such as this, where there are two sites in close proximity to each other, it would be beneficial to the individuals who use these launching ramps to voice their concerns to the entity that is responsible for maintaining the site. In this case, Russell County Fiscal Court is responsible for maintaining these sites.

3. Comment - I completely disagree with the Corps of Engineers finding that the potential for expansion of the Clifty Creek Access Ramp is significant. Accordingly, I'm totally opposed to any plan to expand the ramp.

Response - Existing site conditions and the potential for future development criteria listed in #2 above were used in rating the potential for expansion for each site. Sites, such as Clifty Creek Access Ramp, meeting the criteria for significant

potential for expansion were classified as such. Adjoining property owners must keep in mind that the lake and its facilities are available for the use and enjoyment of all members of the public.

4. Comment - Any increase in the number of boats launching from the Clifty Creek Ramp will increase the present congestion and create a dangerous condition for boaters since there are private docks adjacent to the ramp.

Response - The significant potential for expansion classification indicates that 12 - 25 car/trailer spaces can feasibly be constructed at this site. Since the ramp area is already designated as a "No Wake Zone" (Idle Speed Only), we do not feel that 12 - 25 additional boat launchings during peak usage days will increase the danger to boaters.

5. Comment - Section 7.g.(13) states that one of the common problems at existing launching sites is that the facilities do not comply with the Uniform Accessibility Guidelines as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The Access Board currently recognizes the dynamic nature of water fluctuation such as winter drawdown waves and wakes at boating facilities. Flexibility is provided to designers and operators, understanding that the purpose of the rules is to provide reasonable accessibility to persons with disabilities.

Response - This section of the plan applies to existing sites, most of which were in existence when the lake was impounded back in the early 1950's, before the ADA was legislated. It is true that flexibility must be given on steep terrain such as at many areas on Lake Cumberland. However, many of the existing sites are extremely out of compliance with the ADA standards. Every feasible effort should be made to make all facilities as accessible to all members of the public as possible. For example, parking spaces can be brought into compliance with minimal expense and effort at many of the sites.

6. Comment - If sites cannot be brought up to the minimum standards that are operated by a private entity, with whom does that responsibility fall upon to bring it up to standards or will the site be closed?

Response - All outgranted sites covered by this Supplement are managed by a government entity such as the county or the state. No sites are operated by private entities. There are currently

no plans to close any sites. A site will only be closed if the outgrantee makes the decision to close the site or if the area is determined to be unsafe for public use. The criteria outlined in this Supplement for minimum standards take into consideration the minimal amount of work necessary to upgrade each site. If the state or an individual county makes no effort to upgrade the existing sites that they are responsible for maintaining, applications to develop new facilities will not be accepted from that entity.

7. Comment - Section 8.c.(4) Definition of long time periods for launching needs to be addressed. Rule of thumb for single lane launching is 50 launch and 50 retrievals per day (Source: States Organization for Boating Access Design Handbook for Recreational Boating and Fishing Facilities).

Response - This section requests information on the current level of use at existing sites. Due to the tremendous amount of time and expense that may be required by the outgrantee to accurately determine the number of launches and retrievals per day for a specific site over a period of time, the current level of use will not be based on the number of launchings/retrievals per day. Instead, information that is more readily available such as: 1) Is the parking area full on peak use days such as holiday weekends?; 2) How long are boaters required to wait in line to launch/retrieve their boats?, etc. will be used to determine the current level of use at existing sites. Each outgrant application for new sites must include this information for all existing launching ramps within a 25 mile range of the proposed site in their informal Needs Analysis/Feasibility Study.

8. Comment - Will new construction be on hold until the Carrying Capacity Study is completed even if the facilities under license by the agency have been upgraded to minimum standards? Will there be a chance to review the study by the public?

Response - No, new construction will not be on hold until the Carrying Capacity Study is completed. A Carrying Capacity Study is intended to enhance the knowledge we currently have about visitor use patterns and boat traffic densities on the lake. The information received from a Carrying Capacity Study (once completed) will be used in future management decisions. Once the Supplement to the Master Plan is finalized, it will be implemented. We do not anticipate being able to conduct a

Carrying Capacity Study in the very near future. Once completed, the study can be reviewed by the public.

9. Comment - Section 9.a.(1) Minimum width of ramp should be 14'0" with 6'-0" minimum cyclopean shoulders (80-90 lb. stone).

Response - Nashville District Corps of Engineers Policy requires a 16' minimum width for all new single lane launching ramps on Corps lakes within the Nashville District.

10. Comment - Lilly Creek Access is a single lane concrete boat access facility with paved surface parking area and access road. Stipulations were placed on the Department of Fish and Wildlife for construction due to historical finds in the area. Permission was given to construct the facility if the department did not excavate the existing soil. This limited the access road and turn around to the ramp from the parking area. This stipulation would apply to future expansions of the facility.

Response - Correct. All existing stipulations/restrictions for an area will still apply to future expansions.

11. Comment - The Ono ramp was extended below the ordinary high water by 40 linear feet several years ago by the Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Response - As indicated by the site recommendations contained in the Site Visits (Appendix C to the Lake Cumberland Master Plan Supplement), the ramp needs to be paved down to a lower elevation. Paving the ramp at least down to elevation 685 would improve the use and availability of this ramp.

12. Comment - Develop more parking at Ramsey Point and a second launch area at the point west of and immediately adjacent to the existing ramp. This will alleviate some of the pressure associated with the development of 80 lots at Hickory Point and other lots currently under development.

Response - The Site Visit, contained in Appendix C, classified Ramsey Point as having limited development potential, which means that this site will accommodate approximately 6-12 additional parking spaces. Since this area is outgranted to Wayne County, Wayne County is required to coordinate with the Corps before expanding the parking area. In addition, prior to constructing any new ramps, Wayne County will be required to

follow the application procedures and meet the criteria for new facilities detailed in the Master Plan Supplement.

13. Comment - I think these informational meetings are important to keep dialogue between govt./public open to achieve mutual goals for land use of both sides.

Response - The Corps of Engineers is responsible for the management of public lands and waters under its jurisdiction. In order to most effectively and responsibly manage these public lands, it is important to know and understand what the public thinks of certain issues. Conducting Public Information Workshops such as these is one way in which we have an opportunity to obtain this information from the public.

14. Comment - Need parking lot at Pleasant Hill Ramp. Ramp cannot be used on weekends and holidays.

Response - The Pleasant Hill Access is classified as "No Potential For Expansion". This was an old road that existed prior to impoundment of the lake and later became a launching site. It is not very feasible to construct additional parking facilities on public property at this location. However, Russell County may request to expand this parking area if they would like and we will consider any proposals they may have. Due to the existence of private moorage facilities around the current launching area, the county may wish to look into the feasibility of constructing additional parking facilities on private property.

15. Comment - Fix road at John Street Access. Make it easier to get up and down with boats. This road is getting more traffic than ever. The community is growing all the time.

Response - Many concerns, such as increasing public use and deteriorating facilities at many access points around the lake, prompted this Master Plan Supplement. Russell County is responsible for all maintenance at this site since it is outgranted to them. Therefore, you may wish to contact Russell County to express your maintenance concerns for this site.

16. Comment - My hope is to promote construction of a new ramp at the end of Lake Forest Drive (back side of Slate Branch on Fishing Creek). I understand we have funding from Fish and Wildlife, support of residents, Magistrate, and county

officials. If ramp is established, a community dock would be a plus. This ramp would provide the best access to the hospital.

17. Comment - We need the money we are funded from our state agencies such as Fish & Wildlife. We need the ramp at the Slate Branch area.

18. Comment - Corps needs to approve ramp on Slate Branch so county will build ramp and county does not lose money for that ramp.

19. Comment - We are in favor of a ramp at the end of Slate Branch Road. This is very much needed for our area. It would be a help for local people.

20. Comment - Need boat ramp at end of Slate Branch Road. Would take pressure off number of other ramps.

21. Comment - Boat ramp needed at Slate Branch (will serve many local boaters and fishermen).

22. Comment - Slate Branch road needs a ramp (bad due to population). This area is now just a dumping ground and just takes away from my property value. It is now a safety problem.

Response to Comments 16-22 - The Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, (KDFWR), submitted an application for the proposed ramp at Slate Branch while the moratorium on new launching ramps was in effect. Therefore, we were unable to process the application. Now that the Supplement has been approved and the moratorium lifted, we can accept applications for new facilities. Once the majority of the state's existing sites have been upgraded to their development potential and all safety standards have been met, we can review the application against the criteria contained in the Supplement. However, any proposal for this site must meet the construction criteria outlined in the Supplement. The State's previous plans for a launching site at this location included a total of 13 car/trailer spaces. The Supplement requires a minimum of 25 car/trailer spaces.

Community docks will not be allowed in conjunction with new launching ramps. The guidance for private moorage facilities is covered under the Lake Cumberland Shoreline Management Plan. The current plan allows all existing permitted facilities to remain, but does not allow for new facilities on Lake

Cumberland. However, small courtesy docks to be used for loading and unloading only can be approved in conjunction with a launching ramp. These courtesy docks are outgranted to the state or county, not individuals or groups.

To our knowledge, the county has no involvement with the state's proposal for a ramp at Slate Branch

23. Comment - It appears that your significant sites are all on the lower end of Lake Cumberland. Why is this? The largest population is on the other end of the lake. Why can't we get some help in the Slate Branch area for a new ramp, or at least don't interfere with plans that are already in place.

Response - Sites are classified for their potential to be improved, not their location on the lake. One major limiting factor affecting the potential for development at existing sites is the terrain of the site. Steeper terrain generally limits the amount of additional parking, etc., which can be added. The majority of these sites were developed from 1950 to 1970 before areas such as Slate Branch Road became residential property, or they were existing roads in place before the lake was impounded.

Please refer to #16 for specific information on the proposed ramp at Slate Branch.

24. Comment - Need more ramps ASAP. Lake Access creates large problems for local residents. Corps needs to speed up process on permits. Too slow.

25. Comment - Need new ramps.

26. Comment - Need new ramps.

Response to Comments 24-26 - If existing launching ramps are upgraded to their full potential, it will alleviate some of the problems and reduce the number of additional ramps needed. The permitting process requires coordination with various elements of the Corps such as Corps Real Estate and Regulatory Divisions as well as other agencies such as the Kentucky Division of Water.

27. Comment - More parking at any ramp would be a plus.

Response - Parking is the most limiting factor for boating access around all of Lake Cumberland.

28. Comment - More parking spaces at Burnside Island. The Ohio Navy has taken over. Pulaski County residents can't even enjoy the facilities for the people from the other states.

Response - The lake is open to everyone on a first come, first serve basis. We will forward your comments to the Kentucky Dept. of State Parks.

29. Comment - The Burton Subdivision on Faubush Creek is a really busy launching area that is in need of a ramp and parking area. The lake road also needs improving. Any improvements would be greatly appreciated.

Response - This launching area is outgranted to Pulaski County. Its potential for expansion is classified as Significant, which means that 12-25 car/trailer spaces can be added.

You may also want to make your concerns known to Pulaski County Fiscal Court.

30. Comment - Meeting was very informative. I was not aware of poor track record of counties RE: ramp maintenance.

Response - Prior to this Master Plan Supplement, there were no procedures for evaluating existing launching areas and their potential for improvement.

31. Comment - Meeting was very well attended. Concerns still exist over existing site renovations before new sites are constructed.

Response - We believe that it is only practical to improve and expand existing sites to their full potential before considering new sites which may not be maintained and cause more problems for the counties and the state.

32. Comment - I would like to see Ramsey Point improved with more parking facilities, trash containers, and no swimming posted due to launching. We have two new developments (this past year) on Route 789 with 100 lots being sold. This area cannot endure any more usage from another 100 families. It is frustrating!! We taxpayers are upset!!

Response - The Corps has no control over the development of private property in the vicinity of the lake. The Supplement to



the Master Plan can only deal with existing problems with launching congestion. The proposed Carrying Capacity Study should identify trends in visitor use patterns.

The potential for expansion for this site is classified as Limited (potential for 6 - 12 additional car/trailer spaces). You may choose to contact Wayne County Fiscal Court concerning your request for trash containers and No Swimming signs.

33. Comment - Park Forest Subdivision - Pottershop Road. We (36 owners) would greatly appreciate at least the access road to the lake to be blacktopped down to our concrete ramp, which the Corps helped us build. You did give us a significant rating. On every weekend we have at least 60-80 people. On holiday weekends there are well over 100-150 of our people and this does not include the general public who also use our ramp. There are also 2 other subdivisions on Pottershop Road, which at times use Park Forest Beshears Landing, as it is the only concrete ramp, but access road is really bad leading down to the lake.

34. Comment - Would like to have road black topped from Pottershop Road to ramp (also more parking). Road from Pottershop Road to ramp is very rough and needs drainage badly.

Response to Comment 33 & 34 - As with most launching areas around the lake, the potential for improvement is substantial on public property. However, most access roads are in need of extensive repairs and erosion control. The Supplement can only address the facilities on public property. If the access road leading to the ramp is your main concern, we recommend you discuss this situation with the Wayne County Fiscal Court.

## **B. Other Questions and Comments:**

1. Comment - Launching fees should go directly to the Corps only for launch and ramp site development and parking maintenance.

Response - The legislation authorizing the Corps of Engineers to charge day use fees dictates that all funds collected for this purpose be deposited into the general fund. Some federal agencies are allowed to keep these types of revenues in the area where they were collected under the Demonstration Fee Program. However, the Corps is not included under this program.

2. Comment - Invoke a total moratorium on all additional dock space including commercial marinas. This might present a hardship to potential developments around the lake, but the ecology of the lake must be considered first.

Response - The Corps has strived to limit commercial development to specific sites set aside for such development under the Master Plan, i.e. commercial marina lease areas. Currently, marinas must request authorization to expand outside their existing lease area from the Resource Manager's Office and Real Estate Division.

Individual and community moorage facilities are limited to their current numbers and size requirements contained in the current Shoreline Management Plan.

3. Comment - Limit number of large cruisers on the lake as they contribute significantly to the erosion of the shoreline.

Response - Lake Cumberland is a public lake open to all members of the public, as long as they abide by federal, state, and local laws and regulations. Due to its vast size and depth, Lake Cumberland has seen a steady increase in the amount of large boats such as cruisers over the last several years. The majority of complaints we receive concerning wave action generated by cruisers is that the operators run them at half throttle, which causes more of a wake than if they were being operated at a higher speed. The Corps has no intentions at this time of trying to limit specific types of watercraft on the lake. However, some type of enforcement action may be necessary to make boat operators more responsible for their wave action. This comment will be forwarded to the KDFWR, Water Patrol Section.

4. Comment - Continue to address safety with more public education. The publications (Kentucky Boating Basics & Kentucky Fishing Guide) must be given to every boat owner who launches his boat on the lake. Encourage all community dock associations to provide these to their members.

Response - We will forward this comment to the KDFWR.

5. Comment - Continued and enhanced boat inspections by the Power Squadron and Kentucky Water Patrol.

Response - We will forward this comment to the KDFWR. You may also wish to express your concern to the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary.

6. Comment - We need some kind of garbage control on Wilson Street and John Street.

Response - We recommend you contact the county to discuss your concerns since garbage receptacles and pick up at these locations is a county responsibility.

7. Comment - Non-boaters use the Clifty Creek Access Ramp to swim because there is a lack of swimming areas. The Corps should create a beach in this area of Russell County for non-boaters.

Response - We agree that there is a need for additional swimming areas throughout Lake Cumberland. However, the Corps does not currently have sufficient funding to build or maintain additional recreation areas. We would certainly entertain a request from an existing marina operator or outgrantee (county or state) to develop a facility for non-boaters. However, the steep terrain of Lake Cumberland makes it difficult to develop approved swimming areas.

8. Comment - The cove just west of the proposed launching ramp at Ramsey Point (Mentioned in #12 in the first section of the questions/comments) would be suitable for docks. These docks should go to people from Wayne County by some sort of drawing.

Response - The guidance for private moorage facilities is covered in the Lake Cumberland Shoreline Management Plan. The current plan allows all existing permitted facilities to remain, but does not allow for new facilities on Lake Cumberland.

9. Comment - The Corps should require all county portions of moneys collected at pay launch sites be spent in support of the ramps and roads leading to all ramps in that county whether they are pay ramps or not.

Response - We believe this question is in regard to the money returned to the counties from rental revenues collected from commercial marinas. This money is returned to the counties to offset the tax base revenue lost due to the impoundment of the lake over property that was at one time subject to property taxes. The Corps cannot return money to the counties and then

dictate its purpose. We suggest that you discuss this proposal with your County Fiscal Court.

10. Comment - All boat operators operating a boat with more than 100 HP should have to be licensed. A point system similar to traffic laws and rules should be established. When a boat operator is stopped for reckless operation two times, his operator's license should be removed. Lake Cumberland should have a speed limit of 60 MPH. Lake Cumberland is too narrow and as a river type impoundment, not suitable for speeds in excess of 60 MPH.

Response - We will forward your comments to the KDFWR, since their officers enforce boating restrictions on Lake Cumberland.

11. Comment - It is obvious that many PWC or Jet Skis are operating after sundown when they should be off the water or moored. It may be that marina employees are not emphasizing this fact to the renters or else the operators don't care.

Response - The majority of personal watercraft on the lake are privately owned. Since this is an enforcement issue, we will forward your comment to the KDFWR.

12. Comment - People who are supposed to patrol are not on the water enough at any time of the week, not just holidays and weekends. People see this absence of enforcement and know their chances are almost zero of getting caught breaking the laws.

Response - The Corps of Engineers is fortunate to have an agency like the KDFWR patrolling and enforcing the state boating regulations on Lake Cumberland. Like most public agencies, the KDFWR is limited in budget and manpower to handle a lake the size of Lake Cumberland. We will forward your comments to them.

13. Comment - I would like to talk with someone about right of ways to lake through "private" property.

Response - You may contact our office at 606-679-6337, Monday through Friday 7:30 a.m. through 4:00 p.m. A ranger would be glad to meet you on site, if you wish.

14. Comment - Cumberland Vista area. I feel very frustrated. 18 years on the lake and I feel there is no hope of any improvement. As a resident I feel let down, forsaken. Show us

how to help you. Are there any plans to regulate Ski Dos - so many driving dangerously?

Response - We will forward your concern over personal watercraft to the KDFWR.

As to the other portion of your comments, we are unclear on the subject of your concerns. Please feel free to contact our office at 606-679-6337 to discuss any concerns that you have.

15. Comment - I own approximately 2200' of lake front property on main body of lake near Fishing Creek and plan to retire there. Would like to be notified of workshop on Shoreline Management Plan update.

Your name and address have been added to the mailing list we will use to notify the public of the next Public Information Workshops pertaining to the Shoreline Management Plan.